REMARKS

I.   INTRODUCTION

Claims 1, 7, and 8 have been amended. Support for these amendments can be found at least at page 8, lines 3-11 of the originally filed application. Thus, claims 1-8 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

II.   THE 35 U.S.C. § 112 REJECTION SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner states that it is unclear what criteria is used to determine the distrust/trust selection options in claims 3 and 4. (*See* 4/7/11 Office Action, p. 3). It seems that the Examiner has misunderstood these claims. Claims 3 and 4 recite providing the distrust/trust option to the user and a step that is carried out *if the user selects* the distrust/trust option. So, Applicant is not claiming the criteria, but rather the display of the option for the user to select and the reaction step if the user decides to select the option. Accordingly, the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III.   THE 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) REJECTION SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1, 2, and 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Biswal et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,477,399).

Claim 1, as amended, recites, "[a] method of computer-aided extraction of quantitative information, the method comprising the steps of: acquiring primary data from an object to be examined; processing the primary data on the basis of a primary parameter set to determine a primary result; determining a confidence interval with respect to the primary result; displaying the primary result and the confidence interval; *adjusting the primary parameter set on the basis of a user input, the adjusting being within a predetermined range;* reprocessing the primary data on the basis of the adjusted

primary parameter set to determine a secondary result; and displaying the secondary result."

Although the Examiner rejects the claims under Biswal, the Examiner bases the majority of the rejections on Jesmanowicz (U.S. Patent No. 5,603,322), which is incorporated by reference in Biswal. Biswal discloses "[a]n EPI pulse sequence is performed by an MRI system which acquires images of the brain over a time interval during which the subject performs a function or is stimulated in a pattern." (*See Biswal*, Abstract.). Jesmanowicz also relates to the same field.

The Examiner refers to Jesmanowicz's disclosure of inputting a reference pattern by the neurologist to meet the recitation in claim 1 of *"adjusting the primary parameter set on the basis of an input."* To meet the recitation of the "primary parameter" in claim 1, the Examiner refers to Biswal's fMRI parameter. However, there is no disclosure by Biswal or Jesmanowicz that the fMRI parameter is adjusted *"on the basis of an input."* That is, neither Biswal nor Jesmanowicz disclose or suggest adjusting the fMRI parameter based on the input of a reference pattern by the neurologist. The Examiner tries to cure this deficiency by referring to steps 320 and 322 of Biswal's method and stating that this loop meets the recitation of an "input" in claim 1. (*See* 4/7/11 Office Action, p. 2). The first loop consists of a 90 element voxel vector and the second loop consists of 85 randomly selected vectors, which are selected from the 90 element voxel vector. (*See* Biswal, col. 8, ll. 9-13, Fig. 7). However, Biswal and Jesmanowicz fail to disclose or suggest that the 85 vectors are selected based on a user input or that an adjustment of the fMRI parameter, which the Examiner equates to the recitation in claim 1 of the "primary parameter," is "within a predetermined range." Since no description of such an adjustment is given in either reference, then the "adjusting" step of claim 1 is not met.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Biswal and Jesmanowicz fail to disclose or suggest *"adjusting the primary parameter set on the basis of a user input, the adjusting being within a predetermined range,"* as recited in claim 1. Applicant, therefore,

respectfully requests the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2, 5, and 6.

Independent claims 7 and 8 recite limitations substantially similar to those of claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of these claims for at least the foregoing reasons presented with regards to claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Marcin/

Dated: June 6, 2011

By:_____

Michael Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, NY 10038
Phone: 212-619-6000
Fax: 212-619-0276